

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA


Dianne Barker,	)	No. CV-11-01543-PHX-NVW
Plaintiff,	)	<b>ORDER</b>
vs.	)	
City of Phoenix, et al.,	)	
Defendants.	)	

Before the Court is Plaintiff's Motion to Reopen Case (Doc. 23), which argues that the post-ruling and post-judgment late filing of a response to the motion to dismiss "is unadjudicated." The late-filed response was not designated as a motion and therefore not brought to the Court's attention. In any event, treating the late Response (Doc. 19) either as a motion for reconsideration or as a timely filed response, it in no way undercuts the order granting the motion to dismiss.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Plaintiff's Response (Doc. 19), treated either as a motion for reconsideration or as a timely filed response, is denied.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion to Reopen Case (Doc. 23) is denied.

DATED this 14<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2012.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Neil V. Wake  
United States District Judge